

## Geographic Review Panel 4 – San Joaquin River

**Proposal number:** 2001-F206     **Short Proposal Title:** Relative Contribution of SJR Nutrient Sources

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** Although not mentioned in Staff review, proposal addresses ERP Goal 1 in that low DO in the San Joaquin River has been identified as a problem for anadromous fish. Similarly, the Staff review notes that the proposal is relevant to CVPIA AFRP goals.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Lack of linkage to the San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen Committee is problematic: closer coordination would improve the proposal, as noted by the Staff review.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Agree with TARP that proposal appears feasible, but the Panel is a little more cautious: obvious oversights especially in site selection and recognition of the number and complexity of sources are symptomatic of a lack of familiarity with the study area. This could be easily remedied through partnerships/coordination with local researchers. As noted by the TARP, no mention of characterization of pure end-members. Lack of such input could result in failure due to an otherwise avoidable factor.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Generally concur with TARP that the investigators have sound academic credentials, but note lack of knowledge of the specific (and peculiar) hydrology of the San Joaquin River system.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** None indicated, and is a serious shortcoming in this case.

**6. Cost.** One independent reviewer thought a little high: appears appropriate.

**7. Cost sharing.** None.

**8. Additional comments.**

---

### Regional Ranking

**Panel Ranking:** Medium low

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** Agree with TARP: lack of coordination with locals evidenced in lack of familiarity with San Joaquin River system. This, coupled with the absence of a plan to characterize pure end-members, raises some questions about the prospect for the successful development of a quantitative tool. The Panel would award a

higher rating if local input were included and the proposal included a plan to characterize pure end-members.